

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HTC CORPORATION, et al.

Plaintiffs,

vs.

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED,
et al.

Defendants.

Case No. 5:08-CV-882 JF

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS**

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following process:

Court Processes:

Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)

Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)

✓ Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR, must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)

Private Process:

Private ADR (please identify process and provider) _____

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

✓ the presumptive deadline (*The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.*)
other requested deadline _____

Dated: <u>May 23, 2008</u>	<u>/s/ Kyle D. Chen</u> Attorney for Plaintiffs
Dated: <u>May 23, 2008</u>	<u>/s/ Ronald F. Lopez</u> Attorney for Defendants

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Pursuant to the Stipulation above, the captioned matter is hereby referred to:

Non-binding Arbitration

Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE)

✓ Mediation

Private ADR

Deadline for ADR session

✓ 90 days from the date of this order:

other

IT IS ORDERED.

Dated: 5/28/08



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
Jeremy Fogel